

Applicant: Addison, Paul Stanley, et al.
Serial No. 09/980,770
Filed: 11/01/2001
Title: METHOD OF ANALYSIS OF MEDICAL SIGNALS

Examiner: To be assigned
Group: 3737

REMARKS

Claims 1 – 40 have been cancelled and replaced with new claims 41 – 69. The new claims avoid the multiple seen in the originally filed claims. Additionally, the new claims now include methodological steps. No new matter has been added by virtue of the new claims and their entry is respectfully requested.

The Examiner has not raised any specific objections with respect to the documents cited in the International Search Report and other Information Disclosures before the USPTO. However, to help quicken the Examination process, comments on the relevance of certain prior art documents are enclosed as Appendix A.

Claims 7 – 32 and 36 – 40 are objected to under 37 C.F.R. 1.75(c) as being in improper form because a multiple dependent claim should refer to other claims in the alternative form, and cannot depend on any other multiple dependent claims.

As noted above, the claims have been amended to avoid multiple dependent claims. Accordingly, the objection should be withdrawn.

Claims 1 – 33 provide for the use of using wavelet transform analysis, but, since the claims do not set forth any steps involved in the method/process, it is unclear what method process Applicant is intending to encompass.

Applicants respectfully submit that the amendments to the claims, in the form of new claims 41 – 69, have obviated the rejection which should therefore be withdrawn.

Claims 1 – 33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed recitation of a use, without setting forth any steps involved in the process, results in an improper definition of a process, i.e., results in a claim which is not a proper process claim under 35 U.S.C. 101.

Applicant: Addison, Paul Stanley, et al.
Serial No. 09/980,770
Filed: 11/01/2001
Title: METHOD OF ANALYSIS OF MEDICAL SIGNALS

Examiner: To be assigned
Group: 3737

Applicants respectfully submit that the amendments to the claims, in the form of new claims 41 – 69, have obviated the rejection which should therefore be withdrawn.

Claims 34 and 35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Sun et al. (US 5,778,881).

Applicants respectfully submit that the cancellation of claims 34 and 35 have obviated this rejection, which should therefore be withdrawn.

In view of the above and foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that the claims now on file are believed to be in condition for allowance, and prompt and favorable action is earnestly solicited.

Authorization is hereby given to the Commissioner to charge any deficient fees or to credit any overpayment to account no. 50-0850.

Should there be any question concerning this response or the application in general, the Examiner is respectfully urged to telephone the undersigned so that prosecution of this application may be expedited.

Date: 3/18/03

Customer No.: 26770

Respectfully submitted,



David S. Resnick (Reg. No. 34,235)
NIXON PEABODY LLP
101 Federal Street
Boston, MA 02110
(617) 345-6057